

**CITY OF VICTORIA  
HERITAGE ADVISORY PANEL  
MEETING MINUTES  
AUGUST 20, 2019**

ATTACHMENT G

**Present:** Pamela Madoff, Chair  
Doug Campbell  
Katie Cumber  
Shari Khadem  
Graham Walker

**Absent:** Julie Br        , Hal Kalman, Lisa MacIntosh, Connie Quaedvlieg

**Staff:** John O'Reilly, Senior Heritage Planner  
Lucina Baryluk, Senior Planner  
Lauren Martin, Heritage Secretary

---

The Chair called the meeting to order at 12:05 pm.

**1. 1040 Moss Street (Art Gallery of Greater Victoria)  
Development Permit Application No. 000553**

Attendees: Carl-Jan Rupp, Rance Mok (HCMA Architecture + Design); Jon Tupper, Janyce Ronson, Leslie Hildebrandt (Art Gallery of Greater Victoria); Kaeley Wiseman (CitySpaces)

John O'Reilly provided a brief introduction. Carl-Jan Rupp and Jon Tupper presented.

Panel Questions and Comments

- Has an assessment of the potential significance of the 1977 building been done? John O'Reilly: No.
- Has there been further discussion about heritage designation of the Spencer Mansion? Jon Tupper: The AGGV Board of Directors is reluctant to have the mansion heritage designated. They are concerned about the ability to make changes to the mansion if it is designated; however, they are aware that designation would open up funding possibilities.
- Besides the mansion, what will be retained? Carl-Jan Rupp: A rear portion of the 1977 addition will be retained for functional and financial reasons.
- The plans show some changes to the fa  ade of the mansion. Why is that? Carl-Jan Rupp: It is necessary to undo some of the previous changes to the mansion to facilitate the connection of the new building (the "cloud"). What is the proposed material for the "cloud"? Carl-Jan Rupp: Metal.
- The reduction of the connector from two storeys to one storey is positive as this will improve the views of the mansion significantly. Will the second floor of the mansion be accessible? Carl-Jan Rupp: There will eventually be an elevator inside the mansion. This is not part of the current proposal.
- Regarding the ground floor plan, if the stair element at the corner of the proposed lobby space was rotated 90 degrees, it would open up views of the mansion from the street. Carl-Jan Rupp: The decision was made to bias the stair element towards the visitor's experience of openness at the cost of a view of the mansion from that corner. The landscaping will be integral to the interior experience and is considered to be of higher value than the view of the mansion.

- Regarding the third storey galleries, will there be windows or skylights to bring in natural light? Jon Tupper: To achieve Class A museum status, skylights are not recommended as the temperature and humidity must be mitigated. Windows are a problem for "museum air" and UV and lux levels of light must be controlled. Also the neighbours across Moss Street were concerned about privacy. Carl-Jan Rupp: In this proposal, passive natural measures have been introduced into open spaces to provide operational savings. Windows would increase capital and operational costs.
- Are the neighbours across Moss Street concerned about the loss of their view of the mansion, particularly the upper portion? Jon Tupper: No concern has been voiced by the neighbours and the current view is very restricted. The new construction will be pulled away from the mansion which allows for a better view of the mansion and more interaction with the garden.
- How significant are the changes between the original proposal and the current one? John O'Reilly: In principle, not a lot has changed. The impacts on Moss Street are generally the same; the shape of the stairway to the second storey is different; the physical impact on the mansion has decreased.
- What are the restoration plans for the mansion? John O'Reilly: The applicant intends to restore windows and portions of the front wall that were removed due to the 1977 addition. Evidence is available regarding original window details and siding which will serve as a basis for the rehabilitation. The recommended approach for an addition to a historic building is indicated in Guidelines 13 and 15.
- The footprint is limiting. The northwest solid element (the concrete staircase) that houses the coat room and office obstructs the visibility of the mansion.
- Currently only the cupola of the mansion can be seen from Moss Street; there are also views of the mansion from the corner and that will be restricted by the new building. The existing gallery is a fine modernist structure and that will be lost. However, there will be improvements to the view of the mansion as a whole through the new glass lobby. If the mansion is restored to its original glory, the contrast with the sleek, modern design of the addition will be exquisite.
- There are two areas that could make or break the project in terms of success:
  - the materiality of the "cloud", how it functions, how it is faceted, and how it will perform as part of the streetscape
  - the view of the mansion from within the foyer and mezzanine could potentially highlight the mansion and become part of the experience from the inside and outside.

**Moved**

**Seconded**

That the Heritage Advisory Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000553 for 1040 Moss Street be advanced subject to the applicant considering the following:

- consider taking measures to improve the visibility of the mansion from Moss Street
- reconsider the heritage designation of the mansion
- consider design refinements, including the stair element at the northwest corner of the building, in order to conserve the concentration of character-defining elements on the mansion as viewed from Moss Street.

**Carried (unanimous)**